



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/324,568	06/02/1999	ADRIAN O. MANCINI	0500.01327	1726

7590 10/03/2003

CHRISTOPHER J. RECKAMP
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 606060229

EXAMINER

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/324,568

Applicant(s)

MANCINI ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____



GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

- 1- Col.7, lines 27-67 and col.8, lines 1-3 disclose not only how a subordinate authority is added to a system, but also how the trust between the subordinate authorities and a common ancestor (superior authority) function. Examiner considers Abadi's reference not only disclosing a subordinate as a part of a system but also how it becomes as a part of the system. Examiner suggests Applicant to concentrate on the functions of subordinates oOnce they become as a part of the system as described above. Therefore the Applicant's arguments that Applicant's invention relates to a system that already consist of subordinates authorities are rejected.
- 2- With respect to Applicant's assertion that Abadi does not teach that the superior authority generates data "to dynamically vary validation starting authorities among the subordinates authorities", Examiner refers Applicant's to col.7, lines 41-68 and col.8, lines 1-3 wherein each directory should identify the parent directory's certifying authority; and where many certify authority are present in hierarchical structure having a common ancestor (superior authority); and these certificate authorities are dynamically validate other certify authority under their directory wherein the trust among some are more that others and where the data that is not from users certify from the same certify authority within a directory, then they cross certify the users all the way to the superior authority. Therefore there is a generation of the data by superior authority that allows the certificate authorities to dynamically start a proces according to the rules set forth. However Examiner suggests that if the task of the above arguments is specific in a way to distinguishes Applicant's invention from the Abadi's reference, then Applicant should present that arguments or such amendments in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.
- 3-With respect to changing the trust authority based on the inter trust authority modification data, Examiner considers col.7, lines 59-8 and col.8, lines 1-3 disclose that inter trust between some certify authorities are more than other certify authorities and it is based on that trust structure that changes of inter trust authority will be changed based on the trust modification data. Examiner would reconsider his position if Applicant's claim language be more specific and no new issue will be introduced that would neccesiate a new search. . .